

*Approved Meeting Minutes  
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Working Group  
Jensen Beach, FL  
January 19, 2006*

**Welcome and Administrative Announcements**

Jay Slack called meeting to order at 1:00 PM. The agenda (Encl. 1) and minutes (Encl. 2) were presented.

**Working Group Members**

	Jan. 19	Jan. 20	Alternates
Ken Ammon – South Florida Water Management District	√	√	
Billy Causey – NOAA, FL Keys Nat'l Marine Sanctuary	-	-	
Alex Chester – NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service	-	-	Essie Duffie
Bob Crim - FL Dept. of Transportation	-	-	
Wayne Daltry – Southwest FL Regional Planning Council	√	√	
Dennis Duke - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	-	√	Dave Tipple
Gene Duncan – Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of FL	√	√	
Christopher M. Flack – Office of the Governor of Florida	-	-	
George Hadley – U.S. Dept of Transportation	-	-	
Richard Harvey – Environmental Protection Agency	-	-	
Norman O. Hemming, III - U.S. Attorney's Office	√	√	
Dan Kimball – National Park Service, Everglades National Park and Dry Tortugas	-	-	Mark Lewis
Kenneth B. Metcalf - Department of Community Affairs	-	-	
W. Ray Scott - FL Dept of Agriculture and Consumer Services	√	√	
Kim Shugar - FL Dept of Environmental Protection		√	
Jay Slack – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	√	√	
Craig Tepper – Seminole Tribe of Florida	√	√	
Kenneth S. Todd – Palm Beach County Water Resources Manager	√	√	
Anna Townsend – Bureau of Indian Affairs	-	-	Joe Frank
Joe Walsh - Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission			
Jess D. Weaver – U.S.G.S.	√	√	
Rick Wilkins - Broward County Department of Natural Resource Protection	-	-	Patti Webster
Ed Wright – U.S. Department of Agriculture	-	-	
Vacancy, Miami Dade County	-	-	
Greg May, Special Advisor	√	√	
Ken Haddad, Science Coordination Group Liaison	-	-	Bob Doren

**Whiparound**

Norman Hemming said he was glad to be back and promised litigation updates at future meetings. Dave Tipple was sitting in for Dennis Duke who was attending Congressional hearings on Tamiami Trail. Jay Slack reported he also participated in the hearings on Tamiami Trail and they went very well. Mark Lewis sitting in for Dan Kimble reported he attended a meeting in Tallahassee where there was a strong encouragement that CERP be presented with one voice to the cities and municipalities. Ken Ammon added that CERP was being looked at as a way to manage growth when in fact it should be the opposite. Local government needed to do their job and manage growth or they will never be able to afford CERP. Mark Lewis clarified that municipalities were making decisions without knowing the ramifications of their actions. Greg May added that the Working Group was developing a draft presentation which would be presented the following day. The intent was to develop a tool to provide local governments with the restoration information needed to help them do their job. Wayne Daltry said local governments recognize that CERP is just Goal 1 and asked to have what local governments are doing to help further the Plan on the agenda. Jay clarified that no one implied that local governments were naïve and they were just trying to dovetail what was being done.

Gene Duncan noted the Everglades Coalition would be meeting the following week. He reported that the lawsuit on whether discharge permits are needed to backpump water into Lake Okeechobee was ongoing.

The federal everglades lawsuit hearing had been pushed back to March. Patti Webster thanked Mark Lewis for his comments and agreed that local governments need to be aware of the tools that are available. She reported that Broward County has a Working Group that is helping to work with CERP issues and she was hoping to participate on the outreach effort. **Greg offered to set up a special conference call with Linda Friar and those interested in helping shape the outreach model.**

Wayne Daltry said they met with their delegation and their highest state priority was to find money for the forward pump option that would provide more management flexibility. Their highest federal priority was funding Modified Water Deliveries. Lee County was also working with the RPCs to set up a basin committee for the C-43 basin. He said he has a local government presentation and was interested in other local government presentations. Greg said it would be good to clarify the topics Wayne was interested in and he suggested Wayne give his presentation as an example.

Commissioner Basham welcomed the Working Group to Martin County noting there were no fishing boats out on the water. He added that he appreciated all that the group was doing.

### **Consultation Workshop Overview**

Dave Tipple reported the Regional PDT process had evolved and informal breakout sessions would be held prior to Working Group meetings in order to allow folks to engage in the details and provide input to the team. The first breakout session was held this morning.

### **Scoping for ENP Seepage Management/Bird Drive Project**

Maura Merkel provided a presentation (Encl. 3) reviewing the project objectives, components, costs and real estate features noting the dollars have not been updated. The team had been working on the PMP since June and was now moving into the PIR phase. Project milestones include the screening of alternatives later this year and selecting alternative plan by September 2007. Craig Tepper asked what was being monitored. Larry Gerry replied this would include water quality and baseline monitoring. How much monitoring would be determined after the PIR process and the intent was to fill in the data gaps. Jamie Furgang asked whether they have discussed cost sharing for land acquisition. Maura said that it had not been discussed. The real estate numbers would be worked on once they establish what lands would be needed.

### **Alternatives for L30/L31 N Seepage Management Pilot Project**

Greg Little gave a presentation (Encl. 4) reviewing the study area which had been re-authorized in the L-30 triangle area. He reviewed the four alternatives developed after the team determined the sheet pile alternative would be very expensive. Team recommends proceeding with alternative four which is the hybrid alternative and includes three out of the four technologies considered. Team is waiting for the Project Management Plan (PMP) to be approved and signed.

### **Site 1 Impoundments DRAFT PIR**

Mike Gagowski presented a presentation (Encl. 4) and introduced Jeff Needle. The draft PIR and EA will be sent out for public comment which ends in February 2006. He reviewed the project area, features and costs. Comments can be provided on the draft PIR through the web at [www.evergladesplan.org](http://www.evergladesplan.org). Alternative C has been selected because it best achieves the majority of the objectives and the most cost effective. The reservoir for this alternative is smaller than what was in the recommended plan.

Larry Gerry added that this project and the ENP Seepage Management project reduce seepage out through the conservation levies and reduces the urban withdrawals for the human population. Patti Webster asked about the recreational activities included in the PIR. Mike replied that there would be passive recreation, information kiosk, boardwalks, and O&M boat access, trails around the impoundment along with parking and a single restroom.

### **Lake Okeechobee Watershed PIR**

Beth Turner presented a presentation (Encl 4) and introduced David Unsell noting Daphne Ross was unable to attend. Ten alternatives were identified a year ago and the costs were significantly higher than the cost containment cap. The team was directed to look for potential cost savings and efficiencies. She reviewed

the project purpose and the top three alternatives identified by the team. The team looked at STA size and an operational analysis as well as alternative water quality treatment technologies. Alternatives 2, 4 and 6 will be carried forward as they provide more phosphorus reduction and storage. Even if they wanted to do what was in the Yellow Book the cost would be significantly higher.

David Unsell added that they would manage this project as if it was an Acceler8 project and were making great strides toward the removal of 130 metric tons of phosphorus from the watershed. Through an initiative of the Governor and Senator Pruitt they will provide an opportunity to speed up construction of a component in the Taylor Creek/Nubbin Slough basin which is a high contributor of phosphorus to the lake.

Ken Todd stated that the individual project benefits were not as apparent and said it would be helpful if several of the projects were analyzed together. David said that CERP was a collection of projects that as a group do magnificent things but they would consider project groupings. Larry suggested that a presentation showing system improvements with Acceler8 projects and MWD and CSOP changes in effect. Ken Ammon said they could do it on a collective modeling run basis and provide at the next WG meeting. Ray Scott requested graphics be provided on a full page and for an explanation of the cost containment cap. Larry explained the cap was a revisit of the Yellow Book cost in 1999 and what that number would be today after using the inflation factors. Beth Turner added that the biggest reason for the price was that the features were conceptual and not detailed also the real estate costs have escalated much more rapidly. Ray Scott said the cap bears no relationship to reality. He added that it did not make any sense to impose an artificial financial criteria or constraint. Beth explained the team sees the cap as a reality check and they were formulating alternatives to meet the project goals and objectives.

Gene Duncan said he shared a similar concern and added that there was a direct relationship between the depth of the storage area and the amount of water quality treatment you will get. By using a cap you will have to double up to use a smaller footprint and will get less water quality treatment and spend more money on treatment of the discharge. He asked whether this has been factored. David said they hired two experts to examine what they have done and they were on the right track. Craig Tepper highlighted the fact that there were other things such as Acceler8 that were happening. Ray Scott said that part of his concern was the possibility of locally preferred alternatives and he agreed there were other things going on in this watershed.

David Unsell said the project has a specific scope and it did not include some items which was why they have the LOER program. Two out of three alternatives hit the Yellow Book storage target. If they were able to look at all components that have a high probability of being in place then you will get close have a shot at getting close to the solution. Larry explained that the cost containment cap was not a real cap with legal authority.

### **Public Comment**

Patrick Hayes (Martin County Soil and Water) asked what the 130 metric tons represent - what is currently coming into the lake or the projected increase if the population doubles. David said it was based on a lot of good science ongoing for the past 15 – 20 years. It was science that led them to the Lake Okeechobee Protection Act and Plan and the plan was based on a certain period of record and left them with 455 metric tons of inflow to the lake. There were a number of watershed projects executed by landowners, Department of Agriculture and FDACS that will have a big effect on reducing the amount of phosphorus into the lake. The target into the lake is 140 metric tons 35 of which are atmospheric deposition. It left an amount of 130 tons to be accomplished by another project in order to achieve restoration of the lake. The Lake Okeechobee Protection Plan will be updated in 2006 and all the numbers will be subject to revision. Patrick Hayes requested that the Working Group look at the net cost of not completing this project successfully since it will represent billions of dollars.

Jamie Furgang (Audubon of Florida) expressed her concerns about the scope of the project. The project as currently proposed only considers half of the watershed and will have major implications calculating how much water has to be stored and treated to achieve restoration benefits in Lake Okeechobee. The half of the watershed not being considered will continue to have runoff with pollutants that will go into the lake. They were encouraged when the Governor proposed the LOER project because that along with the CERP

project will get them to their goal. She provided a list of recommendations (Encl. 5) that should be added to the LOER plan which included the addition of 60,000 acres to reservoirs and STAs, setting TMDLs at levels that will have a benefit to Lake Okeechobee and updating CERP and LOPP to address the full health and recovery of the lake.

Norman Hemming clarified that alternative 6 surpasses the storage requirement.

### **C-111 Spreader Canal Bridge Placement and Alignment Scenarios**

Dewey Worth noted some of the issues they dealt with included opportunities lost. As they determine an alignment for the spreader canal and bridge crossing they were losing future opportunities by identifying these things at this point in time. The primary reason being that US 1 is undergoing safety improvement between Florida City and Key Largo. DOT has offered to provide some features and services beneficial to CERP as long as the SFWMD can provide information on requirements. There have also been concerns with how Acceler8 fits into this project. He presented a presentation (Encl. 6) reviewing the project area and the three canal alignments to include costs associated with each. The northern alignment and bridge placement does not provide the level of benefits and will not be considered further. Potential benefits and costs of the central and southern alignments appear similar and the team will complete plan formulation using those alignments.

Jay Slack stated the central alignment has more parcels that need to be acquired and asked how much longer it would take to accomplish that alignment. Dewey replied that because it was an Acceler8 component they were intending to move out with the construction phase in 2007 and they would have to have all the lands necessary for the construction of the footprint as well as those lands that may be affected by the operations. They have had these discussions at the highest levels and the problem is the imminent domain authority they may have to utilize in order to get those lands. They have already been told by a number of landowners east of US 1 that they are unwilling sellers. At this point they do not have much in their tool belt to acquire those lands and meet those deadlines under the milestones they have set. Jay Slack also said there were lands that would be affected by waters that would back up behind the southern alignment and asked about those landowners. Dewey replied that the central alignment and that bubble of water have increased potential to influence private landholdings to the north. The more water they push down the spreader canal to create the sheetflow the greater the potential for forcing the water back north and potentially affect the drainage and landholdings to the north.

Essie Duffie said that NOAA has concerns with the different impact of flows on Florida and Biscayne Bay and would like to see additional information. She asked whether they were planning to backfill the old canal after the spreader canal is built. Dewey the goal was to backfill the lower C-111 canal from S197 back to the spreader canal junction. Acceler8 looks at cost trade-offs and how to move forward with a component that builds a functional aspect of the canal knowing that they may need to restrict that southern flow through the old C-111 and they are looking at costs and impacts.

Jamie Furgang said this project was about restoring flows to Florida Bay in a more ecologically beneficial way and the spreader canal does not get to the root of the problem. The solution was going to be alleviating the current effects of the C-111 canal which is pulling the water out of Taylor Slough and discharging into northern Florida Bay. Although it helps restore the wetlands they have to eliminate the C-111 canal and restore the flows to Taylor Slough without plugging the C-111. The proposed project is not at all what they envisioned when they supported it.

### **Regional Project Delivery Team (RPDT) Feedback**

Jay Slack noted RPDT met this morning complete with project managers, displays and project information. Comments on the white paper were received from members and stakeholders and were forwarded to the Corps. Greg said they have flexibility in scheduling future RPDT and WG meetings. Jay suggested they meet in central locations. Patti Webster asked how projects were chosen to be on the RPDT agenda. She noted that the Broward County WPA draft report will be out and asked for it to be included on the next RPDT agenda.

Larry Gerry stated that the PDTs have gone through a number of changes and there was an effort to cut back on the many meetings that were being held. RPDT was developed in an effort to have the appropriate agency representative present and the WG was thought to be the appropriate venue. He noted they had more interaction today than they ever got at any of the PDT meetings. He encouraged everyone to call the project managers with questions and suggestions.

### **Public Comment**

Patrick Hayes said he was disappointed to hear that the PDTs were hijacked. He said it was unacceptable to go from meeting every other month to no meetings for almost a year and a half was unacceptable. The format held that morning worked well, however, if they were only going to discuss four or five projects then the PDTs will have an input less than once a year and that was not acceptable. They owe it to the PDTs and the general public to follow the Corps' PDT process and meet on a regular basis. Dave Tipple said they want to engage people and emphasized that everyone who has input to get a hold of the project manager and engage. Patrick Hayes said the teams have to meet in order for stakeholders to engage.

Jamie Furgang said she liked the morning's process and the level of transparency. She asked that an agenda for the RPDT be provided and possible group discussions by region. She provided a hand written comments (Encl. 7) on the white paper. She said that good information was imperative and should include performance measures, alternative designs, work schedules and critical paths. PDTs were not being hijacked by stakeholders and the project managers were responsible to control their PDT. She encouraged the use of the web to post meeting notices and project information. This would put the burden on the stakeholder and the public to go and access the information. They also had concern with language in the white paper because it sounded like the PM had complete authority over who could attend a meeting and this could further alienate stakeholders and as an alternative the agency head should decide who from their agency attends.

### **Working Group Outreach Initiative**

Greg May reviewed a second draft outreach presentation (Encl. 8) that would be used to solicit member feedback and refine the finished product. The briefing would consist of three parts. The first part would include an overview and explain why they came up with an ecosystem and intergovernmental approach. It would review the role of the Task Force, the Strategic Plan. The second part would include county specific information which would include a list of projects and maps. The purpose, features and status of each project would be reviewed. The third part, which needs to be developed in partnership with the counties, would address the interactions between the county initiatives and the system-wide restoration initiatives. Ken Ammon suggested including the land acquisition piece and how much land they have and how much remains to be acquired. Counties could understand how those local government programs could work in conjunction with federal and state programs. Wayne Daltry did not think the approach was going in the right direction. Greg suggested that Wayne make his presentation so that the group could get a better idea of what he was looking for.

### **Lee County**

Wayne Daltry stated that goal three was where the local governments have a major role and provided a map of Lee County (Encl. 9). Local governments are required to plan and they have minimum criteria rules that address issues such as transportation, natural resources and parks and recreation. He urged that Lee County as well as the other counties to be brought in as partners and not someone a slideshow is given to. Greg said he would ask Linda Friar to work with Wayne and Ken Todd to develop a better understanding of the issues that need to be addressed and some recommendations on how best to address them.

### **Science Coordination Group (SCG) Update**

Robert Doren provided a presentation (Encl. 10) and reviewed current priorities. He reported that sixteen indicators have been proposed and would be sent for independent review. Battelle completed its independent review of the Plan for Coordinating Science and provided comments which included adding a simplified format to improve the communication of complex ideas and making sure the needs and gaps are in clear plain English.

**Public Comment**

Patrick Hayes thanked Jay for the change in format allowing public comment after each presentation. Lake Okeechobee and the estuaries need to be managed as critical tasks and the costs are incalculable to the economy of south Florida. Averages mean nothing in their attempt to address peak flow problems. The lake is failing dramatically and there are no oyster beds. He hoped the members were asking themselves how they could better manage these critical environmental assets and not for other purposes as they have been in the past.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:50 PM.

*Approved Meeting Minutes  
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Working Group  
Jensen Beach, FL  
January 20, 2006*

**Welcome and Approval of Minutes**

Jay Slack called meeting to order at 9:05 AM noting there were a number of people listening to the webcast. The November minutes were approved with Ray Scott's edits. Jay reported he would provide the Task Force with an update of the consultation that occurred adding there were no significant issues raised.

**Executive Director's Update**

Greg May reviewed what was completed in 2005 as well as what was ahead for 2006. He reviewed the duties of the Task Force. He reviewed the Strategy which contains the common vision, guiding principles and strategic goals that provide the conceptual roadmap to guide the individual projects and programs being implemented by the members. The overarching principle is that the ecosystem must be managed as a whole. He reviewed the 2005 Task Force priorities and status in preparation for the February Task Force meeting where the 2006 priorities would be established. In 2006 the Working Group will work the Task Force priorities as well as update the Strategy, Biennial Report, IFP, Plan for Coordinating Science and the Land Acquisition Strategy.

**Acceler8 Update**

Ken Ammon gave a presentation (Encl. 12) reviewing current and upcoming activities. Upcoming activities include public review of the draft Basis of Design Report for the C-111 Site 1 Impoundment as well as the Picayune Strand levees. Gene Duncan asked whether the issue of the C-43, C-44 and EAA storage reservoir being "Waters of the US" issue had been resolved. Ken said he heard it was EPA's position that they would be "Waters of the US" but that DEP had the lead. Kim Shugar added that DEP was working with EPA to determine if the reservoirs need a different classification. Gene asked about the anticipated water quality being discharged out of reservoir. Ken replied the PIR had a load reduction which has been refined through the Basis of Design Report. The majority of local runoff in the C-44 basin will be captured and treated. Gene asked whether it would take water out of Lake Okeechobee and treat it before it was discharged.

Ken said the PDT that worked on the IRL South and C44 Reservoir did not want a reservoir sized in the C-44 that would treat runoff from Lake Okeechobee. They wanted it only to address the local runoff quantity and quality issue. If CERP would ultimately divert or clean water then they did not want Martin County to bear the brunt in the interim. There will be opportunities in the interim where the lake is high and there is storage available to capture and clean the water. The local constituents insisted that the reservoir be sized just for local runoff.

**Corps Update and Discussion**

Dennis Duke provided a presentation (Encl. 13) that reviewed ongoing projects. He noted the contract for the 8.5 SMA had been awarded and they have completed the revised GRR and SEIS for Tamiami Trail modifications. Construction was underway in the 8.5 SMA and would be completed by the end of this year. They have a recommended plan for Tamiami Trail and it was being transmitted to Secretary Woodley. The selected plan includes a two mile bridge in the west and a one mile bridge on the east combined with raising the balance of the 10.7 mile roadway. The cost estimate of \$144 million kept them within the total cost of \$398 million for MWD. Comments have been received on the selected plan and were being reviewed at the headquarters. If the project is approved and the President includes the funds, then they would initiate construction within a year and MWD will be fully functional in 2009.

The first contract for the Herbert Hoover Dike was awarded and he anticipated awarding the second contract in the fall pending funding from Congress. The Regional ASR Study is continuing in 2006. The EAA PIR assurances section will be out for review and the Indian River Lagoon (IRL) PIR is pending

transmittal to Congress. The Acme Basin B PIR has been suspended and the Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands PIR is underway.

Work on CSOP is continuing and Alternative 5R will be discussed at the Advisory Team meeting on Jan. 25<sup>th</sup>. Guidance Memoranda 4, identification of water, is still undergoing revision. Interim Goals and Targets agreements have been drafted and will be brought before the Governing Board and the Task Force. We're working with DEP to finalize the agreement for the Comprehensive Integrated Water Quality Feasibility Study (CIWQFS). Finally the draft system-wide operational manual has been posted on the web and the first iteration is a compilation of existing water control plans without changes. Ray Scott asked how excess water was identified for the Site 1 impoundment. Dennis explained the Pro Regs "grandfathered in" whatever was in the PIRs completed prior to completion of the Guidance Memoranda. The team had draft of GM 4 that they worked with. The team looked at the modeling output and determined when it would be beneficial to redistribute the water back into the system.

### **Land Acquisition Task Team**

Theresa Woody provided the draft report (Encl. 14) prepared in response to the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. She noted that at the previous Working Group meeting concerning the maps had been resolved and Miami Dade County was now satisfied with them. Members were asked to review the document and provide comments to Theresa by February 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Ray Scott said the Subcommittee asked for an identification of funding strategies and he thought the report could do more about identifying strategies. Appendix C is a useful compilation but the challenges in using those sources were edited out and earlier drafts did a better job of conveying this information. He suggested including the lands they need to acquire, in what order and how they were going to pay for those lands. Greg May acknowledged that the funding strategy portion of the report needed the most work.. He noted that the report was from an intergovernmental coordination body and not from an implementing agency. He said success would be achieved when we provided the information that Congress requested in a way that would be useful to the implementing agencies without getting into the business of implementation. The noted the report identifies four CERP projects with conceptual footprints with high natural land values (or potentially high values after they are restored) and it ranks the natural attributes of those footprints based on a rigorous process. They were looking for ways to bolster the funding strategies without getting into the agencies' business. Working Group members familiar with specific programs can help improve the draft by providing specific language for inclusion in the report.

### **Biscayne Bay Regional Restoration Coordination Team Update**

Linda Friar provided the final draft Action Plan (Encl. 15) noting that minor corrections had been made based on previous comments. Jay said this was the second time report had been presented and the group could accept or reject the report. Dennis Duke made a motion to accept the report and Gene Duncan seconded the motion. The report was accepted without objection.

### **Invasive Exotics Update**

Bob Doren provided a presentation (Encl. 16). He reported that the NEWTT and FIATT were holding joint meetings. The team had also been coordinating with other groups around the country dealing with similar issues including the National Invasive Species Council. He noted a Special Report on Invasive Exotic Plants has been completed for the Corps. He explained that South Florida had been asked to serve as a model to develop a cross cut budget. The initiative would establish performance measures across agencies and help coordinate expenditures and activities for invasive exotic species. Finally he said that the team had developed a comprehensive database which is accessible over the internet. Bob provided a live demonstration of ecosystems which can be viewed at [www.ecostems.org](http://www.ecostems.org). He stressed that it was not a project management system but tracks tasks related to the work being done by many agencies. He asked that agencies assist by helping to populate the database. Jess Weaver asked how this differed from Sofia. Bob explained that it looks at different pieces of information noting that it was impossible to put everything into one database. He said that information that USGS has on invasive species could be pulled out of Sophia and entered into this database. Norman Hemming suggested the federal agencies coordinate with



their legal offices for issues related to FOIA and privileged communication before opening up their databases.

### **CSOP Advisory Team Update**

Greg May reviewed the advisory team's recommendations (Encl. 17) which were provided to the Task Force at its December meeting. He said that the Corps ran fifty eight sensitivity runs and it was now a matter of optimizing the TSP. He noted the team will meet again to review the latest modeling results and provide to the Corps.

### **Public Comment**

Patrick Hayes said he was awed and amazed at the massive effort before this group. They now realize after 150 years the importance of focusing on managing the system as the critical environmental asset to south Florida. He noted there were no fishing boats in this estuary and there have been "do not swim and do not fish advisories" as well. He said they need to ask themselves whether they were in a state of emergency.

Jay Slack said that was why they were working so hard and that now is the time to move forward. Ken Ammon implored everyone to focus on solutions. He said he did not know who would declare the state of emergency and the only thing he could think of was having flexibility in delivering water to areas they have not delivered it before. Maybe it's a relaxation of the regulation stages in the WCAs or maybe it's allowing more water to go through ENP. Regardless of the alternative it will impact someone somewhere in the system.

Jamie Furgang stated the latest draft of the Natural Lands Report was disappointing because it did not have a lot of the information they worked hard to get into the report. A committee in Congress asked them to identify lands and potential funding sources because they were in a crisis. Almost 200,000 acres remain to be acquired and they were looking to the federal government and to getting some funding from Congress. This report was generated by that need and they were selling themselves short by not identifying a way to solve this problem. She asked the group to provide the Committee with the tools they need and asked for the information from the previous draft to be put back in. Greg May thanked Jamie and the team for all their hard work. He reiterated that the area that needed the most work was the funding strategies. He acknowledged that previous versions had examples but noted they were retrospective rather than prospective. He encouraged everyone to provide specific changes if they had recommendations to improve the draft.

### **Open Discussion**

Jay Slack reminded everyone that the next Task Force meeting was on February 22 – 23. He would provide a report on the Working Group consultation. He hoped that everyone would take the information from this meeting back to their respective agencies such as the Biscayne Bay Action Plan. Greg May added that the next step concerning the action plan was to work with the implementing agencies.

Meeting adjourned at 11:51 AM.

### **Enclosures:**

1. Agenda
2. Draft Minutes, November 2005
3. ENP Seepage Management Power Point
4. L-30/L31N Seepage Management, Site 1 Impoundments, Lake Okeechobee Watershed Power Point
5. LOER Plan Summary and Audubon's Goals for Lake Okeechobee Recovery
6. C-111 Spreader Canal Power Point
7. Jamie Furgang's written comments
8. draft Working Group Outreach Power Point Template
9. Lee County Map
10. SCG Power Point
11. Executive Director's Update

12. Acceler8 Update
13. Corps Update
14. draft Natural Lands Report
15. Biscayne Bay Action Plan
16. NEWTT and FIATT Power Point
17. CSOP Recommendations